

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Charuk1970>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

GROUP COUNSELING WITH UPPER-ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
STUDENTS: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

by



DOROTHY J. CHARUK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1970

Thesis
R. J. F.
37

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Group Counseling with Upper-Elementary School Students: An Experimental Study," submitted by Dorothy J. Charuk in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether group counseling would be effective in raising the peer-group status of socially-isolated preadolescent students.

The sample consisted of forty-eight fifth-grade students in thirteen classrooms. The counselors were those regularly assigned to the four schools participating in the study. A pretest-posttest control group design was used. The instrument used in selection and in testing treatment effects was a sociometric test. The pretest was administered to all the fifth-grade classes in the four schools in October, 1968. Those students who received either no nominations or one unreciprocated nomination, when rated by their classmates, were chosen as subjects in the study. Twelve subjects in each school were randomly divided into treatment and control groups of six members each. The subjects in the treatment groups met for counseling once a week over a two-month period. The subjects in the control group received no treatment. In December, 1968, two months after the experimental treatment had begun, the sociometric instrument was given for the second time. Following another two-month interval during which no further treatment was given either group, the instrument was administered for the final time. This was in February, 1969.

Results indicated that the difference in sociometric gains made by the counseled group over those made by the control group were not

statistically significant. However, some treatment effect seemed to be indicated as the difference between the treatment groups approached significance at the .07 level of probability. This difference was maintained over the two month period following the treatment. No difference in counseling effectiveness was found between the counselors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to the following persons for their assistance:

Dr. John G. Paterson, who supervised the study, for his sound advice, constructive criticism, inspiration, and good-natured encouragement throughout its development;

Dr. Thomas O. Maguire, for his guidance, particularly concerning the statistical analysis of the data and interpretation of the findings;

Dr. Lorne D. Stewart, for his cooperation and useful suggestions, and Dr. Harvey W. Zingle, for his support and advice in the early stages of the study;

the counselors, Mr. Carl Blumer, Mr. Richard Cima, Miss Joyce Hendrickson, and Miss Heleen Masciuch, for their interest and dedication in carrying out the experimental phase of the study, and the principals and teachers for their cooperation;

Mr. Kyung Bay and Mr. Dan Precht, for their assistance in processing the data;

Mrs. Vicki Samycia, for typing the first draft of the thesis, her husband Nestor, for the generous use of his office and duplicating equipment, and my husband Dan, for his help, optimism, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE PROBLEM	1
	Need for the Study	1
	Present State of Elementary Counseling	1
	Rationale for the Use of Group Procedures in the Present Study	3
	Definition of Terms	9
	Counseling	9
	Acceptance	9
	Sociometric Technique	9
	Status	10
	Social Isolate	10
	Overview of the Present Study	10
	Hypotheses to be Tested	11
	The Sociometric Instrument	11
	Limitations to the Study	12
	The Instrument	12
	Test Administration and Data Collection	13
	Student Absences	13
	Sample	14

CHAPTER		PAGE
II	SOME RELATED LITERATURE	15
	Implications of the Lack of Peer Group	
	Acceptance in Preadolescence	15
	Introduction	15
	Long-Range Implications	16
	Relation to Self-Concept	16
	Relation to Academic Achievement	17
	Relation to Personality Traits, Social	
	Skills, and Classroom Behavior	20
	Summary	23
	Research Related to the Instrument	24
	Results of Reliability Studies	24
	Test-retest reliability	25
	Split-half reliability	28
	Summary of findings	30
	Results of Validity Studies	32
	Social contact	33
	Teacher judgment	34
	Social adjustment scale	34
	Summary of findings	35
	Group Counseling with Upper-Elementary Students	36
	Related to Underachievement	37
	Related to Social Isolation	38

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Summary and Implications	43
III	RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	46
	The Sample	46
	The Instrument	46
	Administration of the Pretest	46
	Selection and Assignment of Subjects to	
	Treatment Conditions	47
	Treatment	49
	Selection and Orientation of Counselors	49
	Teacher Involvement	50
	Treatment Condition Described	50
	Control Condition Described	50
	Data Collection	51
	First Posttest	51
	Second Posttest	51
IV	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	52
	Restatement of the Problem	52
	Analysis of Variance and Findings	52
	Conclusions	58
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	59
	Summary	59
	The Purpose of the Study	59

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Sample	59
The Instrument	59
The Method	60
The Findings	60
Conclusions and Recommendations	61
SELECTED REFERENCES	66
APPENDICES	78
APPENDIX A	79
Sociometric Test Form	80
APPENDIX B	81
Instructions to Counselors	82
APPENDIX C	84
Letters to Teachers	85
APPENDIX D	87
Letters to Principals, Counselors, and Grade-Five Teachers	88
APPENDIX E	89
Sample Group Counseling Situation	90

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS WHOSE SOCIOMETRIC SCORE = 0	48
II	DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS WHOSE SOCIOMETRIC SCORE = 1	49
III	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS	53
IV	NUMBER OF CHOICES RECEIVED BY TREATMENT AND TIME	54
V	SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF CHOICES RECEIVED BY SCHOOL, TREATMENT, AND TIME	55
VI	FREQUENCY OF SCORES ACHIEVED BY TREATMENT GROUPS	56
VII	MEANS, MEDIAN, AND MODES OF SCORES BY TREATMENT	57

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

I. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Counseling in the elementary school is viewed largely as a developmental, preventive, and remedial process to assist the child in personality development, social adjustment, and learning. Significant developments in the 1950's brought about a recognition that organized guidance programs are as important at the elementary level as they are at the secondary level (Meeks, 1962). However, the particular type of counselor assistance most appropriate for dealing with the various kinds of problems at specific age levels needs to be revealed by further study. A very limited amount of research has been undertaken to test the effectiveness of counseling with children of elementary school age. Those studies that have been carried out have produced a relatively meager amount of conclusive evidence, as contrasted to those done with older students (Kranzler, Meyer, Dyer, and Munger, 1966).

Present State of Elementary Counseling

The implementation of elementary counseling as an integral part of the total education program is a relatively recent event in America, one that has occurred during the 1950's and 1960's (Van Hoose, Peters, and Leonard, 1967).

In a survey of the literature, Faust (1968) reported that from the years 1950 to 1965 elementary counseling had shifted from crisis to

developmental work, from a problem orientation to one of learning, and from one-to-one to both individual and group work. The study of Blair's (1969) comprehensive report on the state of mental health programs in Alberta has been undertaken by the provincial government (Clark, 1970). It was noted that the report strongly advocated a shift in emphasis from methods of cure to methods of early discovery, diagnosis, and prevention. It was stated that "although pupil personnel services elsewhere have progressed through the remedial, preventive, and developmental stages" during the past four decades "they are still mainly in the remedial stage in the province of Alberta (p. 6)."

The 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth advocated the development of counseling services for the preadolescent and recommended the ratio of one counselor to every 600 elementary students (Dinkmeyer, 1968). In December, 1967 the NEA Research Bulletin carried the report of a survey which showed that 85.5% of the estimated total school systems enrolling 300 or more students did not have full-time counselors. A more recent report showed that 42% of all large school systems in the United States were employing full-time elementary counselors (Paterson, 1969).

Like various other educational practices, elementary counseling was pioneered in the United States and is gradually being adopted by Canadian school systems. However, the current counselor-pupil ratio here is still much lower than in American schools. The vast majority of Canadian school systems are, as yet, entirely lacking counseling services at the elementary level. Reports received at the Canadian Guidance and Counseling Association Conference in Edmonton in June,

1969, revealed that the short supply of elementary counselors has, in some cases, resulted in assignments to areas so large that the service provided approximated that of the visiting teacher, school psychologist or guidance consultant. Alberta and Quebec seem to be the forerunners in the field of elementary counseling in Canada, but even in these provinces the schools that have this service are exceptions to the general rule.

Introduced to Alberta in Jasper Place in the early 1960's, elementary counseling was extended to the Edmonton Public School system when amalgamation of the two districts occurred during the 1964-1965 school term. Beginning with four counselors serving twelve elementary schools in September, 1965, the service was expanded to include nine counselors serving twenty-nine schools in September, 1968, (Paterson, 1967). Elementary counselors were then serving from three to five schools each with school populations per counselor ranging roughly from 1500 to 2800 students. The number of elementary counselors has not increased since 1968. The limited number of trained personnel available and the financial shortage for education, at the time of writing, make any major increase in facilitative services within the school system appear remote to the writer.

Rationale for the Use of Group Procedures in the Present Study

There is a need to devise some means which may simultaneously increase counseling effectiveness and extend counseling services to a wider segment of the elementary school population. Shaw and Wursten (1965) suggested that group counseling might provide at least a partial

answer to this problem. They also emphasized the need for more rigorous attempts to study such procedures. Wright (1959) found that research supported a belief in the potential of group counseling. He predicted that continued evaluation of this process may well indicate a need to reorient thinking relative to the practice of reliance on individual methods. Research related to group counseling as a method of producing positive changes in elementary students has been found to be extremely limited (Van Hoose, 1968). The current trend toward group procedures, accompanied by and resulting from an increasing body of research involving adolescents and adults, also makes this seem a most appropriate time to study the effects of short-term group counseling with younger children.

Group counseling was defined in the Report of the ACES-ASCA Joint Committee (1966) as "the process of establishing relationships with a small group of children enabling them to communicate with the counselor and each other certain identified needs." Such counseling was said to be "particularly helpful in personal and social growth as children have an opportunity to react and interact and to work out some of their behavioral changes (p. 103)." The committee concluded that group counseling provides a major learning experience in human relations.

Basic to the rationale for group counseling is the fact that human beings are essentially social beings (Dreikurs and Sonstegard, 1967). Interpersonal communication and interaction are vital to the socialization process. Wrenn (1969) viewed group counseling as a

"professional development that holds great promise for improving the amount and quality of personalized communication," as the interaction and communication that takes place in the group are highly relevant to the interests and needs of its members. He predicted that if group counseling was introduced widely into the schools, the coming generation might even learn to communicate better with people of other generations, subcultures, and nations.

A convincing case for the implementation of group counseling procedures in schools was made by Paterson (1968). Its application regarding socially isolated or alienated children seems particularly appropriate.

Group counseling helps the participants to socialize their attitudes and to become increasingly appreciative of satisfying human relations. Some members lose feelings of isolation as they feel accepted and understood in the group. The group's acceptance, understanding, and support help the members to move from such negative feelings toward others as dislike, competition, and envy to such feelings defined broadly as acceptance, identification, helpfulness, and cooperation, and at the same time help members to achieve a balance between dependency and independence (p. 92).

Gazda (1969) viewed group counseling as lying on a continuum between group guidance, which is primarily preventive, and group psychotherapy, which is remedial. Group counseling was seen as both prevention and remediation oriented.

Bishop (1969) suggested that the guidelines for clarifying the rationale, role, and function of the elementary counselor are to be found within the "construct developmental (p. 2)." The need for a position which allows for and accommodates different emphases with different age groups was also recognized by Gazda. He advocated the

developmental approach which utilizes the concept of developmental tasks with subsequent coping behaviors to serve as broad general guidelines for the group counselor. Gazda stated that for a complete theory of group counseling, some type of developmental approach is essential. He saw the "bio-socio-psychological development task concepts" of Havighurst, the "psychosocial crises" of Erickson, and the "vocational development" of Super, et al. serving as "rough guideposts in locating potential problem areas for purpose of preventing problems through group guidance and prevention and remediation of problems of inadequate coping behaviors for certain developmental stages through group counseling (pp. 22-23)."

The developmental approach was also taken by Van Hoose, Peters, and Leonard (1967) who advocated group counseling, in addition to individual counseling, as a most appropriate tool for the elementary counselor. They noted that it is during the preadolescent stage of development wherein a major push away from emotional dependence on parents is made. Accompanying this increase in independence is an increase in peer identification, particularly with those of the same sex. The likelihood of children being much more verbal with each other than with adults was cited as another advantage in group counseling for this age level.

In keeping with this view, Krumboltz (1968) referred to the group counseling environment as one which facilitates learning and enables members to benefit in ways not possible in a one-to-one situation. He suggested that children can learn more from each other than they can individually with a counselor. Referring to

the Marshall and McCandless (1957) reports of consistently negative correlations found between emotional dependence on adults and peer-group popularity, Dinkmeyer (1965) suggested that dependence may interfere with adjustment to schoolmates. The writer proposes that group counseling should provide a means for the child to gain in independence through the development of a problem-solving attitude with which to approach his difficulties. An added advantage is seen in the instant feed-back from one's own peers rather than from an adult while in the process of testing new coping behaviors. An example of a problem-oriented group counseling session with sixth-grade boys is shown in Appendix E.

A major developmental task faced by the preadolescent is the working out of satisfactory peer relationships (Dinkmeyer, 1965). A significant coping behavior, to be developed at this stage, is the establishment of peer-groupness and learning to belong (Gazda, 1969). A perusal of the literature reveals that some children fail to accomplish this and that such failure tends to be predictive of adjustment problems at a later stage (Kagan and Moss, 1962). If social learning is best accomplished in a social setting, as suggested by Dinkmeyer (1968), and if, as Dreikurs and Sonstegard (1967) contended, group counseling is a natural tool for dealing with human relationships, it seems reasonable to expect that the ability to form positive peer-group relationships might be developed in a counseling situation with a group of peers who share a common concern.

Most groups are formed on the basis of the "common-problems" approach. Some advantages of this are the facilitation of group

cohesiveness, mutual support, empathy and insight, and the provision of focus or direction (Blocher, 1966). Most of the literature on group counseling indicates that these are essential to the optimal growth of the individual in a group counseling situation.

The subjects used in the present study were those who appeared to be having difficulty in relating to and identifying with others. For this reason, it was anticipated that these individuals might have less than average ability to function as a group. However, the purpose here is not to evaluate group counseling as such, but rather to determine whether, as Ohlsen (1966) suggested, group counseling might be shown to hold some promise as an avenue through which the socialization process can be facilitated at the upper-elementary level.

In addition, it was hoped that the results of this study might suggest a basis for further research in this area. Research and evaluation have been designated by Blocher (1966) as the only vehicles for improving counseling practices. It was also pointed out that if needed resources are to be obtained from administrators and taxpayers there must be some evidence of counseling effectiveness. Moreover, research in this area could provide additional knowledge concerning the development of effective human behavior. Blocher concluded that an examination of the present state of knowledge in counseling research provides relatively little information that is useful in terms of the purposes stated above. This has been found to be particularly true at the elementary level (Dinkmeyer, 1968). The present study is intended to make an admittedly modest contribution to that body of knowledge.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Counseling

Counseling refers to a function, a personal relationship, and a process through which a professionally trained counselor assists another person or small group to communicate and to meet immediate and future needs (Dinkmeyer, 1968). Growth is facilitated through changes in perception, conviction, attitudes, and behavior. Counseling is a learning process which puts emphasis on the learner as a responsible, decision-making individual, and it is differentiated from therapy which places greater emphasis on personality reorganization.

Acceptance

Acceptance is used to refer to the positive attitudes of one's peers toward him. It involves social recognition, approval and preference; the development of warm, interpersonal and liking relationships; and fulfillment of the individual's need to belong within the peer society.

Sociometric Technique

The sociometric technique consists of asking each individual in the group to select, in confidence, those members of the group with whom he prefers to associate for a specific activity or in a particular situation. From the answers obtained, the choices each individual receives are added to produce a sociometric score. Scores thus achieved were used in the present study as measures of peer-group acceptability.

Status

Status shall be used to refer to the degree of social acceptance or the sociometric rating afforded an individual by his peers. It is not, for the purpose of this study, concerned with socioeconomic or other criteria commonly associated with the term.

Social Isolate

The term, social isolate, shall be used to describe an individual of low sociometric status. Those designated as such in the present study are, with the exception of recent transfers, individuals who received either no choices or one choice, not reciprocated, when given a sociometric rating by their classmates.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Permission to carry out the study was granted and the selection of four elementary schools, being served by a counselor, was made by Edmonton Public School Board administrative officials. The investigator did not act as a counselor in the study.

The sample consisted of forty-eight fifth-grade students. On the basis of a sociometric rating by their classmates, these students were designated social isolates.

By random selection, the students were divided into two groups which were equal in terms of number and sociometric status in each of the four schools. One group in each school was involved in group counseling on a weekly basis over a two-month period while the other group, which served as a control in the study, received no treatment.

A second rating was made immediately following termination of the counseling treatment and a third rating was made after another two-month interval had elapsed.

IV. HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

It was expected that the statistical outcomes of the study would support the following hypotheses:

1. The sociometric ratings of the counseled group would be significantly higher than those of the control group immediately following the counseling treatment.
2. This difference would persist over a two-month period during which no further treatment would be given.
3. No significant differences would be found between the counselors in terms of treatment effect obtained.

V. THE SOCIOMETRIC INSTRUMENT

The sociometric instrument, devised by Joseph L. Moreno in 1934, is purported to measure the degree to which individuals are accepted in a group, reveal relationships which exist among these individuals, and disclose the structure of the group itself. Its use in the present study pertains to only the first of these factors.

Various forms of this test have been produced, with criteria ranging in number from one to eight choice behavior situations, and choices allotted to each ranging from one to an unlimited number. The literature suggests that the use of fewer than five choices tends to result in decreased test reliability; whereas any increase beyond

five makes no appreciable difference. In the present study, the sociometric rating was based on six possible choices.

Several test forms, currently in use, require the individual to state his order of preference, in some cases for the entire group. Other forms instruct the individual to make a number of negative responses. Since no reliable evidence is available to validate any particular weighting system, and since the advisability of encouraging children to make negative responses is highly questionable, neither of these types was used in the present study.

One form, commonly used in schools, measures on three criteria, allowing three choices for each variable: playmate, workmate, and seating companion. As choice of workmate may be influenced to some degree by competence as well as liking relationships, this item was deleted from the form used in the present study. A copy of the test used is included in Appendix A.

VI. LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

The generalizations to be drawn as conclusions in this study are made in the light of the following limitations:

The Instrument

Under certain conditions and within specified limits, outlined in the review of the literature, sociometric tests are generally considered to be relatively dependable. However, as they do not readily lend themselves to the usual tests of reliability and validity, they have been criticized for their lack of sophistication. Through

the years they have undergone various modifications and revisions, but they are, as yet, imperfect measures. Until such time as a more precise instrument is developed, they will remain in use, because despite their limitations, they appear to be the most accurate means available for determining an individual's peer-group status.

Test Administration and Data Collection

Minor variations in the administration of the tests might be assumed as a result of the number of people involved. In each case, however, the tests were given by either the classroom teacher or the counselor, and the results indicate general adherence to the printed instructions provided.

Student Absences

Student absences, which are always a problem in sociometric testing, may have had some slight effect on the test results. Reports from the counselors indicate, however, that a consistent effort was made to administer tests to absentee members upon their return to class. In most cases, where this was not possible, lists of the absentees' names were submitted along with the completed tests. As the incidence of absenteeism appeared to be relatively slight, it is assumed that the overall effects of this would be minimal.

Since the factors noted above relate to test administration and data collection procedures within and between classes, rather than between treatment conditions, there seems to be no reason to expect that their influence would be systematic.

Sample

Although recent transfers to the participating schools were excluded from the sample, no provision was made to exclude those individuals separated from previous classmates as a result of class reorganization for the fall term. The incidence of such separations was reported to be slight, although exact figures are not available. In any case, there appears to be no reason to assume that the assignment of such subjects to the two treatment conditions would be in substantially disproportionate numbers.

CHAPTER II

SOME RELATED LITERATURE

I. IMPLICATIONS OF THE LACK OF PEER GROUP

ACCEPTANCE IN PREADOLESCENCE

Introduction

The importance of the peer-group in the study of child development has been recognized by theorists and researchers since the beginning of the century. As a result, the accumulated literature on this subject is now quite voluminous. In 1964, Campbell completed a review of the research on children's peer relations to that date. He warned that research on peer relations suffers from the same methodological imperfections found in most of the behavioral science research, and for this reason, the nature of the inferences that can be made from it are limited. One problem is that correlational analysis of data obtained from a single source or a single point in time may lead to the appearance of strong relationships, but they preclude truly effective separation of concomitance from causation. On the other hand, some low relationships may be more attributable to a lack of good measurement instruments than to inadequacy of theory. In perusing the literature, the writer has attempted to keep such limitations in mind and to present an account of the findings which appear to be most representative and which have particular relevance to the present study.

Long-Range Implications

Although causation is extremely difficult to determine in this area, some studies have provided what appear to be fairly reliable indicators of probability. One such study was completed by Kagan and Moss (1962). This careful, detailed analysis of long-term behavior trends and their intercorrelations was based on an intensive, comparative study of eighty-nine subjects over a thirty-year period. They reported that, "the most dramatic and consistent finding of (that) study was that many behaviors exhibited by the child during the period six to ten years of age were moderately good predictors of theoretically related behavior during early adulthood (p. 266)." The first four or five years of school appeared to be a particularly important period for learning academic skills, resolving dependent ties, and working out peer-relationships. It was reported that, for some children, peer experiences tended to strengthen patterns of dominance, social spontaneity, and positive evaluation. For others, peer rejection and a perception of marked deviation from peer valued attitudes seemed to lead to social anxiety, social submissiveness, and a sense of ineffectiveness.

Evidence that school sociometric ratings tend to be predictive of adjustment in high school, holding of leadership positions, and early school drop-out was similarly reported by Gronlund and Holmlund (1958).

Relation to Self-Concept

The view that a child's assessment by others is related to his

own self-picture is supported by a considerable amount of research. An extensive review of the literature led to the conclusion that the peer-group is generally regarded as a determinant of acceptance and stability in social relations and as a contributor to the development of self-concept (Campbell, 1968). Although a direct causal relationship has not been clearly established, significant positive correlations between peer-group status and self-concept have generally been indicated (Ausubel, Schiff, and Gasser, 1952; Horowitz, 1962; Williams and Cole, 1968).

McCandless (1961) reported that a good deal of evidence has been found which indicates that a child with a poor self-concept will be more anxious, more defensive, less well adjusted, and less effective, as well as less popular than a child with a more positive self-concept. Rosen, Levinger, and Lippitt (1960) found that low status boys in their early teens were most anxious to bring about change in themselves, and Coleman (1961) found a similar tendency among high school students.

Relation to Academic Achievement

Several studies have shown positive correlations between sociometric status and achievement (Brown, 1954; Gade, 1961; Grossman and Wrighter, 1948; Muma, 1965, 1968; Williams, 1958). In a sample of 700 fourth-grade students, underachievers were found to be significantly different from achievers in the area of peer relationships as well as in measured personality variables (Teigland, Winkler, Munger, Kranzler, 1966).

Social status and utilization of intelligence were shown to be

related in several studies such as that undertaken by Epperson (1963). Using 753 pupils in the third to twelfth grades in twenty-seven rural, industrial, suburban and university communities, he found that high isolation was related to low utilization of a student's academic potential.

Van Egmond (1960) also found an association between social status and utilization of ability. Girls with high liking status and boys with high influence were both found to perform higher in accordance with their ability than those with lower status and influence. A number of studies have shown similar results (Epperson, 1963; Epperson, Luski, and Schmuck, 1961; Keislar, 1955; Schmuck, 1962, Schmuck and Van Egmond, 1965; Sears, 1959). It was theorized that academic performance is conditioned by emotional contents associated with self-concepts as peer and pupil, and that these self-concepts are formed, in part, by a pupil's liking relationships with his peers. It appeared to Schmuck and Van Egmond that low status in the classroom has a demoralizing effect which adversely affects utilization of the intellect. This interpretation receives considerable support from the finding that self-perception of low status is even more crucial than actually having low status.

A preliminary analysis of eight upper-elementary classrooms revealed that pupils who demonstrated an awareness of their own low social status were lower utilizers of their academic abilities than pupils who were aware of their high social status (Schmuck, 1962). In a subsequent study with 424 upper-elementary students, similar results were found (Schmuck, 1963). Those students with low actual

liking status and those who viewed themselves as holding low liking status were shown to be lower utilizers of their abilities than those with higher actual and perceived status. It was also found that those who conceptualized themselves as being liked although they had low actual status, utilized their abilities more highly than those who were aware of their low status. Those who viewed themselves as holding low status were found to have more negative attitudes toward themselves and toward school than those with higher perceived status.

The research of Piaget in 1929 led to the conclusion that it is during the period of preadolescence that the concept of self begins to form (Dinkmeyer, 1966). Self-concept is viewed by a number of theorists as central to behavior (Dinkmeyer, 1965; Lundholm, 1940; Rogers, 1951; Sarbin, 1952; Snygg and Combs, 1949). Significantly positive correlations between self-concept measures and conception of school, social status at school, emotional adjustment, mental ability, reading achievement, and mathematical achievement were found in a study with eighty sixth-grade students (Williams and Cole, 1968).

Coopersmith (1959) and Fink (1962) also obtained positive correlations between self-concept measures and academic achievement. Deficiency in self-esteem has been postulated as a significant determinant of underachievement (Bruck and Bodwin, 1962; Walsh, 1956). Communication from the peer-group is thought to be one of the more decisive determinants of both self-evaluation and achievement (Williams and Cole, 1968).

Wattenberg and Clifford (1962) noted that the measures of self-concept and ratings of ego-strength made at the beginning of

kindergarten proved to be more predictive of reading achievement two years later than was the measure of mental ability. Lewis (1968) has concluded that academic achievement does not necessarily affect self-concept to the extent that it is affected by it.

The literature has generally indicated that sociometric status, self-concept, and utilization of ability are highly related. However, there was some suggestion that this relationship did not hold when peer-group values did not favor academic performance, as appeared to be the case with lower-class boys (Pope, 1953; Porterfield and Schlichting, 1961).

Relation to Personality Traits, Social Skills, and Classroom Behavior

The literature reviewed by Kranzler, Mayer, Dyer and Munger (1966) indicated that correlations between sociometric status and various measured personality characteristics had been found in a number of studies (Austin and Thompson, 1948; Brown, 1954; Hunt and Solomon, 1942; Loban, 1953; Smith, 1950; Smith, 1958). Correlations were also reported to have been found between peer-group status and social skills (Biddulph, 1954; Breck, 1950; Bretsch, 1952; McCrow and Tolbert, 1953).

Some studies have shown that children of high social acceptability tended to possess desirable, positive personality characteristics while those low in social acceptability tended to lack these attributes (Feinberg, Smith, and Schmidt, 1958; Gronlund and Anderson, 1957). It was also found that children of high social acceptability showed a tendency toward active social participation,

cooperation, and conformity whereas low acceptance children lacked this tendency (Bonney and Powell, 1953; Jennings, 1950).

Conversely, it was reported that children of low social status tended to exhibit undesirable or negative characteristics, such as annoying others, showing off, restlessness, nervousness, feelings of inferiority, and emotional instability (Jennings, 1950; Tuddenham, 1951).

Children who are well accepted by their peers were described by Dinkmeyer (1965) as generally outgoing, emotionally stable, dependable, cooperative, socially adaptable and friendly; whereas children generally rejected by their peers were described as demanding, arrogant or apathetic, having few outgoing interests, reflecting a considerable amount of egocentricity and introversion, and were considered shy and withdrawn. Lack of peer-group acceptance was said to result in feelings of inferiority, a negative self-concept and certain anti-social behaviors.

In general agreement with this view, were the findings of Lippitt and Gold (1959). They reported that pupils low in peer-group liking status were found to express less positive affect toward others than did those high in peer-group status. Others have found friendliness and sociability to be associated with peer-group acceptance (Feinberg, Smith, and Schmidt, 1958; Tuddenham, 1951), and social indifference, withdrawal, hostility, and rebelliousness associated with low-status or rejected children (Northway, 1944; Smith, 1950).

A number of studies have reported significant behavior differences between children of high and low sociometric status (Bonney, 1943;

Bonney and Powell, 1953; Feinberg, Smith and Schmidt, 1958; Jennings, 1950; Lorber, 1966; Northway, 1944; Smith, 1950, Tuddenham, 1951).

Lorber's (1966) study indicated that children who were socially unacceptable to their classmates tended to manifest disruptive, attention-seeking behavior in the classroom. It was suggested that although such behavior might contribute to the loss of social acceptance, the probability is greatest in favor of peer-group rejection having a causal relationship to the observed behavior. This interpretation was supported by such writers as Bernard (1952), Bonney (1960) and English (1952). The view taken was that the socially ineffective child will tend to continue any overt activities that reward him with the social attention he is seeking. It was suggested that the disruptive, attention-seeking behavior serves, at least superficially and temporarily, to appease his ego needs and that it also functions as a means of expressing and communicating dissatisfactions and frustrations suffered as a result of social failure with his peers. Persistence in such behavior might conceivably impair the development of rewarding interpersonal relationships, thereby creating a circular and self-perpetuating type of interaction.

In a study using newly-formed adolescent groups, evidence was found suggesting that children's reputations were more stable than their behavior (Campbell and Yarrow, 1961). This led to the inference that reputations, which are quickly established, shape expectations and, in part, elicit behavior that is in accordance with such expectations. A similar conclusion was reached by Polansky, Lippitt, and Redl (1950) in their contagion studies. The relative prestige assigned

to an individual appeared to be a fairly powerful determinant of his behavior.

Summary

Peer-group status has been found to be related to development in such areas as: self-concept, academic achievement, various personality traits, social skills, and general classroom behavior. A number of researchers and theorists have suggested that peer-group acceptance may to some degree, bear a causal relationship to some or all of the observed correlates.

Dinkmeyer (1965) expressed the view that belonging is a basic need and that it asserts itself within the peer-relationships. A lack of acceptance by the group was said to cause feelings of inferiority and was described as "the greatest hardship a human being can endure (p. 163)." Although this does seem to be a rather emphatic statement, a considerable amount of research supports the view that alienation from the peer society has a tendency to impede the normal development of the individual in the social, emotional, and academic areas. Gronlund (1965) reached the conclusion that, without special help, isolated and rejected individuals are unlikely to improve their social position.

The results of such studies as those referred to in the foregoing account indicate that there is a need for intervention at some point to offset the trend toward isolation and alienation for some children.

II. RESEARCH RELATED TO THE INSTRUMENT

As sociometric ratings appeared to be the most effective means available for assessing an individual's peer-group acceptance, various efforts have been made to determine the reliability and validity of these measures.

Results of Reliability Studies

Anastasi (1966) stated that in its broadest sense, test reliability indicates the extent to which individual differences in test scores are attributable to chance errors of measurement, and the extent to which they are attributable to true differences in the characteristic under consideration. As used in psychometrics it refers to stability or constancy. Test reliability, according to Anastasi, is the consistency of scores attained by the same persons when retested with the identical test or with an equivalent form of the test.

Practical application of sociometric results assumes some constancy of sociometric choices. However, as Gronlund (1959) pointed out, perfect consistency is neither expected nor desirable, owing to the dynamic nature of social relations. Revealing actual changes in such relations is as important a requirement of the sociometric test as providing results that are constant enough to have predictive value. Although these conflicting requirements (revealing change and providing constancy of results) also occur with psychological measuring instruments, the greater variability in the area of social relations poses special problems in evaluating the reliability of the sociometric test. As special techniques for coping with these problems

have not yet been devised, it has been necessary to utilize the traditional concepts of reliability developed in the area of psychometric measurement. Despite the obvious limitations in this procedure, some evidence has been found concerning the extent to which sociometric responses are constant under various conditions.

Techniques normally used to measure reliability are: test-retest, split-half, equivalent-form, and the interitem consistency test. Attempts to measure the reliability of sociometric tests have been made using the first two of these procedures.

Test-retest reliability. The test-retest technique provides a reliability coefficient, also referred to as the coefficient of stability, which is simply the correlation between the scores obtained by the same subjects on two administrations of the test.

Relatively few studies have been undertaken to determine the stability of sociometric status at the nursery school and kindergarten age levels. Studies such as those done by Northway (1943) and Bronfenbrenner (1945) have not produced impressively high stability coefficients, particularly where time lapses of several months occurred between test administrations. However, Gronlund (1959) reported that those highly chosen by the group did tend to remain highly chosen, while those with low group acceptance tended to remain in that category. It seems, therefore, that although stability of choice diminishes with time, extremes in sociometric status tend to remain fairly constant. Social preferences, always subject to a certain amount of fluctuation, are particularly variable among the

very young. The test-retest measure of reliability appears to be more appropriate when applied to the sociometric ratings of school-age children.

Greater efforts have been made to determine test-retest reliability of the sociometric instrument at the elementary school level. Studies carried out in camp settings where acquaintance-span would be a significant factor and some done with exceptionally small samples have produced some conflicting results as well as generally low correlations. However, studies which involved an entire class or several classes of students have generally provided somewhat higher reliability coefficients.

With a class of twenty-seven fourth-grade students, Byrd (1951) found a correlation coefficient of .89 between scores on tests given two months apart. With nine classes of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students, Gronlund (1955) reported an average stability coefficient of .75 over a four-month period. Similarly, Bjerstedt (1956) obtained a correlation of .82 between scores attained by three classes of upper-elementary Swedish children on tests given four months apart and with a nine-month interval between tests, he reported an average stability coefficient of .72. Two separate studies were done, each using four classes of sixth-grade students who were tested at intervals of one, four and five weeks. Stability coefficients obtained in the two studies ranged from .85 to .92 (Thompson and Powell, 1951) and from .60 to .90 (Witryol and Thompson, 1953). In both cases, the highest correlation coefficients were obtained over the one-week

interval and the lowest over the five-week interval.

Bonney (1943) studied the stability of sociometric scores over one-year intervals, for a three-year period. He administered a sociometric test to forty-eight second-grade students, repeating the test each year until they had progressed through the fourth-grade. Sociometric status at each grade level was determined by combining the choices each pupil received on a number of criteria based on classroom and social activities. Stability coefficients ranged from .67 to .84 for the one-year intervals between the successive grade levels. Intelligence tests and achievement tests were administered to the same pupils each year as a basis for comparison. Coefficients of stability for the intelligence tests ranged from .75 to .86 and for the achievement tests from .60 to .83 for the same one-year intervals. Sociometric scores, based on a number of sociometric criteria, were indicated to be as stable from one year to the next as were the intelligence and achievement test scores.

Evidence obtained from test-retest reliability studies tends to indicate that sociometric results may be used with reasonable confidence at the elementary school level. A number of studies have been carried out at the secondary school and college levels. Generally, these have produced equally high or higher reliability coefficients.

The research has indicated that sociometric status tends to be most stable over short periods of time and that constancy of choice tends to increase with the age level of the children being tested. Studies by Thompson and Powell (1951) and by Gronlund (1955) also indicated that a greater degree of stability seemed to exist among

the scores in the extreme sociometric positions than among those in the average categories.

Split-half reliability. The split-half test for reliability divides the test into comparable halves, providing a measure of equivalence, or adequacy of item sampling. The correlation obtained between the scores in the two halves is known as the coefficient of internal consistency. This technique has been used less extensively in reliability studies dealing with sociometric measures than has the test-retest method. The practical implications of the findings resulting from such studies are undeniably quite limited. Although researchers have generally reported rather high coefficients of internal consistency, there are several notable exceptions.

One study involving sixth-graders produced unusually high correlations ranging from .93 to .97 (Grossman and Wrighter, 1948). In a much more extensive study, correlations ranged from .54 to .86 with elementary and junior high school students and from .89 to .90 with high school students (Ausubel, Schiff and Gasser, 1952). A correlation of .90 was reported in each of two separate studies with college students (Bass and White, 1950; Ricciuti and French, 1951).

Coefficients of internal consistency have tended to be highest when test items were based on general criteria and when choice situations had some psychological similarity. Northway (1940) obtained correlations ranging from .64 to .84 using general criteria only, and lower correlations ranging from .37 to .50 between criteria based on particular skills and those based on general factors.

In a study involving 632 boys and 626 girls in the sixth-grade, Gronlund (1955) attempted to determine the extent to which sociometric status was related on three types of general sociometric criteria; seating, work, and play companions. The average correlation coefficients ranged from .75 to .86 for boys and .76 to .89 for girls. The highest correlations were found between seating and work companions for both sexes, with the lowest correlation between work and play criteria. Individuals in extreme sociometric status positions on one criterion tended to maintain this position on the others. Loeb (1941) had previously investigated the same problem using twelve classes of students from the fourth to the eighth grades. A composite sociometric status score based on four criteria was correlated with another composite sociometric status score based on four different criteria. The correlation coefficients obtained ranged from .65 to .85.

Bjerstedt (1956) conducted a study with thirty classrooms of Swedish children in grades three to eight. The average correlation coefficients between sociometric status as a workmate and as a friend were found to be .84 for the lower grades and .74 for the higher grades. The declining degree of reliability indicated in relation to age was attributed to a greater tendency on the part of older students to discriminate among criteria.

Bronfenbrenner (1945) reported a similar decline from fall to spring in elementary classrooms. The more variable sociometric status of individuals from one criterion to another in the spring was thought to be related to the greater degree of acquaintanceship as well as increased age of the students, leading to more discrimination in

sociometric responses. There is also the possibility that motivational factors might have induced older students, particularly near term-end, to choose workmates more on the basis of particular skills rather than strictly on the basis of liking-relationships.

Whereas test-retest reliability measures of sociometric tests have generally indicated that stability of sociometric status increases with the age of the students; split-half reliability studies seemed to suggest that the degree of internal consistency of sociometric results tends to decline as the age (discrimination) of the students increases.

It has been suggested that correlation of scores on different test items is inappropriate as a measure of reliability for this type of test, as this procedure is based on the assumption that all items are measures of the same factor or trait. However, the literature did suggest that in sociometric ratings, a general acceptability factor was operative in the choosing process. Reliability studies showed that sociometric tests based on general criteria, rather than on specific skills, produced results that were not only more stable over time but obtained, as well, a greater degree of internal consistency. (They were also reported to be more closely related to other measures of social acceptability and for this reason were said to have greater validity).

Summary of findings. Although limitations in the techniques used to determine the degree of sociometric test reliability are recognized, some general trends which seem to be relevant to the

effective use of these tests have been indicated:

1. Stability of sociometric results tends to increase in relation to the age of the group members.
2. Stability of sociometric results tends to increase in relation to the size of the group.
3. Stability of sociometric results tends to decline in relation to the time span between tests.
4. Extreme sociometric positions tend to be more stable and more consistent over various situations than the more average sociometric positions.
5. Sociometric status scores based on general criteria or psychologically similar choice situations tend to be more stable over time and in various situations than scores based on specific criteria.
6. Composite sociometric scores based on several criteria tend to be more stable than those based on a single criterion.
7. The sociometric status of individual group members tends to be more stable than the social structure of the group.
8. The use of anywhere from five to an unlimited number of choices tends to provide similar and more stable results; whereas the use of fewer choices tends to provide less stable results.

9. In newly-formed groups, sociometric status scores tend to be less stable than those in well-established groups.
10. The degree of internal consistency of sociometric results tends to decrease in relation to the age and acquaintance-span of the group members.

Results of Validity Studies

To the degree that a test actually measures what it purports to measure it is said to be valid. Anastasi (1966) stated that sociometric nominations have generally proven to be one of the most dependable of rating techniques. Lindzey (1954) reported that when such ratings have been checked against a variety of practical criteria dependent upon interpersonal relations, they have been found to have high predictive validity. Anastasi concluded that the reasons for this are:

1. The number of raters is large and includes all group members.
2. An individual's peers are often in a particularly favorable position to observe his typical behavior, and may therefore, be better judges of certain interpersonal traits than are his teachers, supervisors, or other outside observers.
3. The opinions of group members, right or wrong, influence an individual's actions and hence partly determine the nature of his subsequent interactions with the group.

As other comparable groups may be expected to react toward the individual in a similar fashion, sociometric ratings were deemed to have content validity.

The determination of validity usually requires some independent external criteria, of whatever the test is designed to assess, against which sociometric results may be measured. The choice of such criteria poses particular problems for sociometry. Although actual social contacts, teacher judgments, and personality adjustment scales have been used most extensively and correlate reasonably well with sociometric results, they are subject to various limitations.

Social contact. A certain amount of discrepancy between actual social contact and stated choice is expected. Sociometry requires only an individual's statement of preference; whereas actual contacts are influenced by the exigencies of the particular situation. Low correlations might result from such factors as environmental limitations, personal inhibitions, varied interests and abilities, and lack of reciprocal feeling on the part of the preferred associate. With pre-schoolers, Frankel (1946) found a low correlation (.50) between sociometric scores and actual social contact. With fourth-graders, Byrd (1951) obtained correlations of .76 and .80. In a study of adolescent boys in a camp setting, a correlation of .76 was observed by Newstetter, Feldstein, and Newcomb (1938). Gronlund (1959) stated that, in general but especially at the elementary level, choice behavior had been shown to be significantly related to observed behavior. Some researchers contend that the degree of difference

observed between stated choice and actual contact may indicate that the two methods are evaluating different aspects of social behavior and cannot, therefore, be directly equated.

Teacher judgment. Teacher judgment is another criterion against which sociometric results have been measured. Various limitations in this procedure have also been recognized. The validity of rating systems based on an outsider's observations has not been shown to be particularly high (Travers, 1966). In rating social acceptance, the intimate interactions that occur between peers are not readily discernible to an outside observer. Furthermore, the criteria used by children for judging social acceptability appear to be somewhat different from those used by adults (Gronlund, 1965). An average correlation of .60 between sociometric results and teacher judgments has been found in a number of studies (Gronlund, 1951; 1955; 1956; 1958). As might have been expected, a lower average correlation coefficient of .48 was obtained when 103 teachers were required to predict the exact choices made by each pupil in an extensive study with fourth, fifth and sixth grade classes (Gage, Leavitt, and Stone, 1955).

Social adjustment scales. The literature indicates that a positive relationship exists between sociometric status scores and measures of social adjustment. In general, those children who were found to be high in sociometric status were characterized by greater conformity and group identification, greater emotional stability and

control, more social aggressiveness, greater dependability and attitudes of friendliness, cooperation, and good will (Bonney, 1947; Dinkmeyer, 1965; Jennings, 1950), as well as a higher level of achievement on developmental tasks appropriate to their age level (Schoeppe and Havighurst, 1952). Cox (1953) attempted to measure change resulting from psychotherapy, utilizing both Thematic Apperception responses and sociometric status as criterion measures. On the basis of that study, it was concluded that sociometric status did appear to be a valid index of behavioral change.

The most comprehensive analyses of the research concerning sociometric phenomena was reported to have been done by Gronlund in 1959 and Remmers in 1963. In Barclay's (1966) summary of this research, he stated that in the best procedures of correlational psychology, sociometric measures were found to be broadly related to the same dimensions measured by other group and individual personality type tests. Sociometric measures were reportedly related to ratings of mental health (Bower, Teshvonian and Larson, 1958; Fitzsimmons, 1958; and Gronlund, 1959), the California Test of Personality (Bedoian, 1953), the High School Personality Questionnaire of Cattell (Guinouard and Ryschlak, 1962), the Rorschach (Tindall, 1955) and as in Cox's study, the Thematic Apperception Test (Mussen and Porter, 1959).

Summary of findings. Although it has been suggested that validating criteria of indeterminate reliability and relevancy may have tended to depress some of the correlations reported in the

literature, Gronlund concluded that in general, studies have shown sociometric results to be significantly related to the actual behavior of students, to teachers' judgments of their social acceptance, to adults' ratings of their social adjustment, to the reputations they held among their peers, to specific problems of social adjustment, and within limits, to problems of personal adjustment.

The research specifically concerned with the peer-group status of preadolescents generally indicated a relationship to self-concept, academic achievement, certain personality traits, social skills, various socially approved behavioral characteristics and future adjustment. Although causation was not established, there appeared to be a circular or cumulative effect of one variable upon another.

Barclay (1966) concluded on the basis of his investigation of the research, that sociometric elections may be said to possess considerable concurrent validity. Lindzey (1954) attributed to them a high measure of predictive validity regarding matters concerned with interpersonal relations. They have been identified specifically as predictors of school drop-outs (Barclay, 1966; Gronlund and Holmlund, 1958; Kuhlen and Collister, 1952). Anastasi (1966) stated that they were also deemed to have content validity.

III. GROUP COUNSELING WITH UPPER-ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

A number of studies have been carried out to test the effectiveness of group counseling with upper-elementary school students. In some of these studies, the criteria used for selection has been

underachievement, while in others it has been low sociometric status.

Related to Underachievement

Ohlsen and Gazda (1965) attempted to appraise the outcomes of group counseling with underachieving fifth-grade students. The sample included twenty-two subjects whose intelligence quotients were reported to be 116 or above, whose achievement test scores were at least one grade level below that expected, and whose grades were B or less. They participated in eight weekly group counseling sessions of approximately one hour each. These sessions were led by counselors experienced in group counseling.

Data used to evaluate counseling outcomes were obtained from revised forms of the Behavior Rating Scale and the Picture Story, both originally used by Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff and Southard; a revision of the Social Acceptance Scale designed by Rath; the Shannon-Shoemaker Perceptions of Self Test; the Iowa Test of Basic Skills; and grade-point averages.

The results were reported to be generally disappointing as far as academic achievement was concerned. Where significant gains were obtained they usually involved increased congruence between perceptions of self and ideal self or increased acceptance of peers. Teachers' and parents' comments indicated improved behavior and attitudes of the students as well as marked improvement in psychosomatic illnesses.

Spielberger (1962) investigated the effects of group counseling with fifth-grade underachievers and their parents, using reading

subtests of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills as the criterion for measuring the treatment effects. The parents met once a week for group counseling sessions with the teachers present, for a period of thirty weeks. The sessions were from sixty to ninety minutes in length. Fifth graders also met in groups with the counselor for the same period of time but with the counseling sessions lasting only thirty minutes each.

Statistically significant improvement in reading achievement was reported. Teachers observed positive changes in conduct and work habits. Parents indicated that they found the counseling sessions generally valuable. These results seemed to favor the counseling condition. However, a serious limitation to this study was the sample size of only fourteen subjects.

Although the literature on group counseling with adolescent underachievers is quite extensive, few studies on group counseling with preadolescent underachievers have been reported. The need for further study seems quite apparent, as few inferences can be drawn from the limited amount of research done to date in this area.

Related to Social Isolation

A number of studies have been undertaken to determine the effectiveness of group counseling as a means of raising the socio-metric status of upper-elementary school students. Here, again, the findings have generally been inconclusive as a result of recognized limitations in the studies.

Least promising results were obtained in a study by Oldridge

(1964) in which subjects were selected from teacher referrals of students from kindergarten through grade eight. At the end of the treatment condition, the students rated their classmates by means of a Guess Who sociometric instrument. It was reported that the groups who received either individual or group counseling showed less improvement in sociometric status than did their counterparts who served as a control group and received no counseling. Inferences that may be drawn from these results are limited as a result of the relative unreliability of sociometric tests with younger children as well as the selection procedures used. Another factor which was believed to be significant to the findings of both this study and the following one was the counselors' lack of experience in counseling elementary school children.

Munger, Winkler, Teigland, and Kranzler (1964) attempted to study the effects of counseling on fourth grade underachievers, in terms of changed sociometric status. No significant differences between the counseled students and the control group were found. Unfortunately, the details of this study are not available.

Biasco (1965) compared the effects of individual counseling, group counseling, and teacher guidance upon the sociometric status of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students with low sociometric ratings. Again, no significant difference was found between the sociometric gains of the counseled students and those who received no counseling.

Similarly, Mayer, Kranzler, and Matthes (1967) compared the

effects of counseling, teacher guidance techniques and a no-treatment condition on the sociometric status of fifth and sixth grade students. The subjects in the experiment were students who were not only found to be in the lower half of their classes in sociometric status, but also reported a desire to improve their peer-group relationships. Of the ninety-seven possible subjects, eighty-seven were selected to be randomly assigned in equal numbers to one of the three treatment conditions. Those in the counseling treatment condition received a combination of group and individual counseling with counselors who were trained and experienced in elementary counseling. Groups of four or five subjects met for forty-five minute sessions twice each week over a three-week period. Following this, each of these subjects received individual counseling in weekly thirty-minute sessions for a period of six weeks.

Although the mean sociometric gain score for the subjects in the counseling condition was greater than that for the subjects in either the teacher guidance or control condition, these differences were found to be not statistically significant. A teacher-rating instrument was used to test changes in social skills. Again, it was found that although the mean gain score for the subjects in the counseling condition was greater than that for the subjects in either the teacher guidance or control condition, these differences were not statistically significant.

It was assumed that these subjects, having expressed a need for improved peer relations, would be motivated to change their peer-group

behavior. However, this concern was not reflected in the counseling situation, and it did not become a major topic of discussion. It was suggested that had the teachers administered the sociometric test and used the results for seating arrangements and for organizing work groups, students may have responded differently to the testing. It was also felt that the time spent in counseling was insufficient. The results of this study, as well as those of Biasco, Munger, et al., and Oldridge, seemed to cast doubt on the effectiveness of short term group counseling in raising the sociometric status of elementary school children.

More encouraging results were obtained by Kranzler, Mayer, Dyer, and Munger (1966). They compared the effects of counseling, teacher guidance, and a no-treatment condition on fourth-grade students, using sociometric status as the criterion. The five students receiving the lowest number of choices in each of four classrooms were selected as subjects of the study. From each of four classrooms, two subjects were assigned to the counseling condition, one to the teacher guidance condition, and two to the control condition.

The eight subjects assigned to the counseling condition met for group counseling twice a week for six weeks. Then they divided into two groups, each meeting once a week, for another twelve weeks. During this time each subject also met individually with the counselor once a week.

The four subjects assigned to the teacher guidance condition were identified to the teachers as children of low sociometric status.

The teachers were given a list of suggested procedures to aid them in dealing with these students.

Neither the subjects who served as a control group nor their teachers were advised of their participation in the study, and no unusual attention was given to them.

Significant differences in the relative frequency with which subjects increased or decreased in sociometric status were shown to favor the counseling condition over the control condition. These differences were found to persist over a seven month period, at the same level of significance ($P \leq .05$).

Differences between the counseling and teacher guidance conditions were not statistically significant, although the evidence seemed to support the possibility of some temporary teacher influence on the sociometric criterion. However, it was noted that the number of subjects assigned to the teacher guidance condition was limited to four at the time of the first posttesting and that this was reduced to three by the time of the second posttesting.

Since the primary purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of counseling, the teacher guidance and control groups were combined for further statistical analysis. No significant differences were found between the counseled and combined groups at the time of the first posttesting. However, at the time of the second posttesting, the differences were found to be statistically significant ($P \leq .05$). The researchers attributed this discrepancy to a failure on the part of the subjects in the teacher guidance condition

to maintain increases in sociometric status over the seven month period.

Summary and Implications

For the most part, the literature reviewed failed to provide convincing evidence of group counseling effectiveness with pre-adolescent social-isolates.

Procedures used in some of the studies were believed to have had a tendency to negatively bias the results. Some of the limitations reported in the studies were:

1. Lack of experience of the counselors in counseling with elementary school children.
2. Limited time spent in counseling in order for the counseling to be effective or for the effects of counseling to be recognized and accepted by others.
3. Selection of subjects from teacher referrals rather than on the basis of sociometric criteria.
4. The use of sociometric criteria in one study involving young children.

Although studies involving group counseling with preadolescents have not, for the most part, obtained a statistically significant difference in treatment effect, those differences that have occurred seemed generally to favor the counseling condition.

Although of no statistical importance, some indications of student benefits reported in a number of studies seem to support a belief in the potential of group counseling with this age group.

Some of the observations noted in various studies were:

1. The increase in sociometric rating seemed to be generally greater for the counseled groups than for the control groups, following the treatment period.
2. More positive attitudes toward school and peers were expressed in the counseling sessions or reported by either teachers or parents.
3. Teachers felt that the close interpersonal student-counselor relationship had encouraged a closer student-teacher relationship.
4. Academic improvement (not measured for significance) was observed by some teachers. (In one study, reading improvement reached a statistically significant level.)
5. Increased congruence between perceptions of self and ideal self and increased acceptance of peers were shown to be of statistical significance in one study.
6. Increased freedom of communication with an adult was evidenced by some of the teachers.
7. Classroom participation had reportedly increased after group sessions began.
8. Improved behavior, attitudes and work habits were observed.
9. A decrease in the number of detentions and incidence of psychosomatic illnesses were noted.

In the research reviewed, only one study was found in which the experimental group was reported to have shown less improvement than the control group. Subjects in that study were chosen from a number of teacher referrals and were later tested on sociometric criteria. As the study included subjects from kindergarten through grade eight, the lesser reliability of sociometric measures with young children may have confounded the results somewhat.

Although the experimental evidence available at this point is not conclusive, the literature generally seems to indicate that group counseling can be of benefit to some students. The need for further study has been emphasized by a number of the researchers.

The present study incorporates several features of the Kranzler et al. study. The main ones are: the use of sociometric criteria for the selection of subjects with peer problems, a second posttesting to determine the stability of gains in sociometric status following treatment, and the use of group counseling techniques, upper-elementary students as subjects, and trained, experienced elementary counselors.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

1. THE SAMPLE

Four elementary schools which were selected by Edmonton Public School Board administrative officials participated in the study. These schools all had regular part-time counseling services. From a total population of 279 fifth-grade students in thirteen classrooms, 48 subjects were selected to constitute the sample. Selection of subjects was based on the sociometric rating of these students by their classmates.

The Instrument

The form of the sociometric test used in the study was one which instructed the students to name, in confidence:

1. The three classmates whom they would most like to sit near in school.
2. The three classmates with whom they would prefer to play at recess.

Administration of the Pretest

The sociometric instrument was administered to all fifth-grade classes in the participating schools between the middle of the first and second weeks of October, 1968. In each case, this was done by either the classroom teacher or the counselor. The absent members, whose terms of absence did not exceed the prescribed limits, were

given the test upon their return to school. The completed tests from each school were collected by the counselor. The scoring of tests and random assignment of subjects to treatment groups was done by the researcher.

Selection and Assignment of Subjects to Treatment Conditions

From the total population tested, only twenty-three students received a sociometric score of zero. In one school only four such students were found. As no valid conclusions could be drawn from so small a sample, the decision was made to include as subjects those students who received only one choice, provided that that choice lacked reciprocity. The assumption was made, and seems to be supported in the literature, that the difference in the degree of isolation experienced by these two groups of subjects would be negligible. With the exception of recent transfers to the schools, the sample then included:

1. All students with a sociometric rating of zero.
2. A random selection of students with a sociometric rating of one, wherein no mutuality of choice was indicated.

In order to equalize the size of groups, the name of one student in category 2 was randomly deleted from the list of possible candidates in one school. In another school, one student in the same category was retained although his prolonged absence from school prevented the determination of possible mutuality of choice. All subjects in the study were designated as isolates and henceforth treated as one group.

The resulting sample consisted of twelve subjects in each of the four schools. These were randomly divided into treatment and control groups of six members each. (The subject whose state of isolation was indeterminate was assigned to the control group.) The following tables show the distribution of subjects by sociometric score in the four schools represented.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS WHOSE
SOCIOMETRIC SCORE = 0

Treatment Condition	School				Total
	A	B	C	D	
Experimental	5	2	3	2	12
Control	4	2	2	3	11
Total	9	4	5	5	23

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS WHOSE
SOCIOMETRIC SCORE = 1

Treatment Condition	School				Total
	A	B	C	D	
Experimental	1	4	3	4	12
Control	2	4	4	3	13
Total	3	8	7	7	25

II. TREATMENT

Selection and Orientation of Counselors

The four counselors participating in the study were those currently assigned to the selected schools.

As elementary counselors, all had received graduate training in Educational Psychology, which included specific courses and a practicum in counseling. All were experienced in individual counseling with elementary school students. Previous experience in group counseling ranged from none to a limited amount. All of the counselors expressed an interest in the study and a willingness to participate in it.

Copies of the thesis proposal and written instructions were distributed to the counselors. Through discussion various details

were clarified. A copy of the instructions is included in Appendix B.

Teacher Involvement

Information about the study was disseminated to the teachers through the counselors and by an explanatory letter prepared by the investigator. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix C. All of the teachers agreed to cooperate in the study.

Direct involvement of the teachers was limited to the release of students for counseling and the administration of tests. Wherever possible, tests were administered by the counselors.

The teacher-awareness variable was controlled by advising the teachers of those students acting as subjects in the control group as well as those assigned to the treatment group. The subjects were described to their teachers as individuals who may need assistance in developing more positive peer-relationships.

Treatment Condition Described

The six subjects in each school who were assigned to the treatment group met weekly for group counseling sessions of from thirty to sixty minutes duration. Within these limits the time allotment was left to the discretion of the counselor. After a two-month period the counseling treatment was terminated.

Control Condition Described

The six subjects in each school who were assigned to the control condition received no treatment. These students were unaware of their participation in the study.

III. DATA COLLECTION

Outcomes were checked on the basis of changes in sociometric status. The instrument used to measure the amount of change was the one originally used for selection of subjects.

First Posttest

The sociometric test was administered to all grade five classes in the four schools within one week after termination of the counseling treatment. This occurred during the second or third week of December, 1968.

Second Posttest

Following a two-month interval, during which no further treatment was given, the same test was administered to all grade five classes for the third and final time. This was done during the second or third week of February, 1969.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

I. RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects in terms of increased sociometric status, of short-term group-counseling with a sample of socially isolated fifth-grade students. The following hypotheses were proposed:

1. The sociometric ratings of the counseled group would be significantly higher than those of the control group immediately following the counseling treatment.
2. This difference would persist over a two-month period during which no further treatment would be given.
3. No significant differences would be found between the counselors in terms of treatment effect obtained.

II. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE AND FINDINGS

The experimental design involved three variables: schools, treatments and times. Change in sociometric status was tested by submitting the scores obtained on the two posttests to a three-way analysis of variance with repeated testing on the time factor. The level of significance for testing the hypotheses was set at .05. A summary of the analysis of variance of the sociometric nominations received by the subjects in the two treatment groups is presented in Table III.

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES FOR THE
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Probability
<u>Between Subjects</u>	100.66	47			
Schools	2.53	3	.84	.38	.77
Treatments	7.59	1	7.59	3.38	.07
Schools X Treatments	.61	3	.20	.09	.96
Subjects within groups	89.92	40	2.25		
<u>Within Subjects</u>	45.50	48			
Times	.01	1	1.04	.01	.92
Schools X Times	2.86	3	.95	.92	.44
Treatments X Times	.51	1	.51	.49	.49
Schools X Treatments X Times	.53	3	.18	.17	.92
Times by Subjects within groups	41.58	40	1.04		

The data revealed no significant differences between schools, between treatments, or between times. The only difference which approached significance (.07) was that found between the two treatment conditions.

No interaction was found between scores achieved by the treatment groups on the first and second posttests, indicating that there was no differential effect between groups over time. The number of choices received by treatment and time are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF CHOICES RECEIVED BY TREATMENT AND TIME

Treatment	(Pre-Treatment) *	Time I	Time II
Experimental	(12)	35	31
Control	(13)	18	21

*The number of choices indicated in parentheses were those received on the pretest, prior to the treatment conditions, and were not included in the analysis of variance.

The differences found between the treatment groups favored the counseling condition. This tendency was shown to be consistent among the four schools at both times of testing. A summary of the number of choices received by school, treatment, and time is presented in Table V.

TABLE V

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER OF CHOICES RECEIVED
BY SCHOOL, TREATMENT, AND TIME

School	Treatment	Time I	Time II
1	Experimental	11	7
1	Control	4	4
2	Experimental	6	7
2	Control	4	4
3	Experimental	11	8
3	Control	7	6
4	Experimental	7	9
4	Control	3	7

The number of choices received by treatment and time, as shown in Tables IV and V, would seem to indicate a fairly high degree of difference between the two treatment conditions. This was also shown to be reasonably consistent over time. An explanation for the lack of significance of this difference is found in the rather wide variation between individual scores within the treatment groups. The frequency of scores achieved by both treatment groups is shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI

FREQUENCY OF SCORES ACHIEVED
BY TREATMENT GROUPS

Experimental				Control			
Score	Pretest	Time I	Time II	Score	Pretest	Time I	Time II
0	12	6	5	0	11	12	13
1	12	10	12	1	13	8	4
2	-	4	5	2	-	3	4
3	-	2	-	3	-	-	3
4	-	-	1	4	-	1	-
5	-	1	1	5	-	-	-
6	-	1	-	6	-	-	-

The means, medians and modes of sociometric scores by treatment are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
MEANS, MEDIAN AND MODES OF SCORES
BY TREATMENT

Measure of Central Tendency	Experimental			Control		
	Pretest	Time 1	Time 2	Pretest	Time 1	Time 2
Mean	.50	1.46	1.29	.54	.75	.86
Median	.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	.50	.00
Mode(s)	.00, 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.00	.00

A glance at Table VI shows that the number of sociometric nominations received by those in the experimental group ranged from 0 - 6, and by those in the control group from 0 - 4. From Table VII it may be readily seen, however, that the bulk of scores remained grouped toward the lower end of the distribution for both treatment groups.

III. CONCLUSIONS

1. Hypothesis I

At the end of the treatment period, the difference in sociometric rating between the experimental and control groups was not found to be statistically significant.

2. Hypothesis II

The difference observed between the experimental and control groups two months after termination of the counseling treatment was also found to be not statistically significant.

3. Hypothesis III

No significant difference was found in treatment effect between counselors. This hypothesis was therefore supported by the data.

Although the degree of differential treatment effect found between the counseled and control groups in this study did not reach the expected level of significance, these data do lend considerable support to the hypothesis that group counseling is effective in helping some children become more socially acceptable to their classmates. One unexpected finding was the differential effect produced by the treatment on the children in the experimental group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY , CONCLUSIONS , AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The Purpose of the Study

The present study undertook to test the effects of short-term group counseling, with a sample of socially-isolated fifth-grade students, in terms of increased social acceptability to their classmates.

The Sample

The sample consisted of 48 students in four schools. It was drawn from a total population of 279 fifth-grade students in thirteen classrooms. The basis for selection was the number of sociometric choices received when rated by classmates. Included in the sample were those students who received either no choices or one unreciprocated choice. (Recent transfers to the schools were excluded.)

The sample consisted of 12 students in each of the four schools. In each school, 6 subjects were randomly assigned to the experimental condition and the other 6 subjects to the control condition.

The Instrument

The sociometric instrument used was one which asked the students to select, in confidence and from among their classmates,

their preferred playmates and seating companions. Three choices were allotted to each item. The test was administered to all grade five classes in the four schools in October and December, 1968, and again in February, 1969.

The Method

The experimental groups met once a week for counseling over a two-month period. The control group received no treatment. The teacher-awareness variable was controlled by identifying all the subjects to their teachers as individuals who may need assistance in developing better peer relationships.

At the end of the two-month period when treatment was discontinued the sociometric instrument was administered for the second time. Following another two-month interval during which no treatment was given, the sociometric test was administered for the final time. The data obtained were submitted to statistical analysis to determine the effect of the treatment.

The Findings

In terms of sociometric gains made by the subjects in the two treatment conditions, no significant difference was found between them at either time of testing. However, a trend was shown which favored the counseling treatment and approached the level of significance (.07).

No differences were found between the counselors in terms of differential sociometric gains made by the counseled groups over

gains of the control groups in their respective schools.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research undertaken to test the effectiveness of group counseling with elementary school children has been extremely limited. The studies that have been reported have generally produced inconclusive or conflicting results. Those using sociometric gains as the criteria for measuring outcomes have, for the most part, failed to obtain significant differences as a result of the treatment. They have, however, shown a general tendency for the counseled groups to make more sociometric gains than those made by the control groups. In this respect, results of the present study concur with those previously reported. This indicates the need for continued research to determine the procedures and conditions most favorable to the achievement of significant positive outcomes.

The varied combinations of a number of seemingly pertinent factors in these studies make it difficult to determine which ones were most relevant to the outcomes. It would therefore be presumptuous to attempt to draw any definite conclusions or generalize too widely on the basis of these few findings. The conclusions offered here should therefore be considered tentative, pending further investigation.

1. In the present study the degree of difference shown between the treatment groups appeared to be greater than could normally be attributed to chance factors alone. As treatment was

the only factor known to the investigator to be systematically different between the groups, treatment effect appears to be the most probable factor accountable for this difference.

2. Various factors which were either unforeseen or considered beyond effective control by the investigator may be seen as limitations in the present study. The possibility of inequalities resulting from randomization, limitations of the sociometric instrument and testing procedures, the incidence of student absences and the limited acquaintanceship span of some students are factors which may conceivably have produced part of the observed difference. On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that such occurrences would function in favor of the treatment group as they could as readily have biased the results in a negative direction.

3. The greatest single weakness in the present study is seen by the researcher as the length of time provided for counseling. It is believed that this was insufficient for the counseling to be effective with some students or for the effects of it to be observed or responded to by classmates. The study by Kranzler et al. (1966) which was carried over a much longer period with more intensive treatment provided did show significant differences between treatment groups. More research incorporating those features of the Kranzler study should be carried out. In the present study, gains that were observed immediately following the treatment tended to taper off slightly after the treatment was discontinued. It might be suggested that group counseling in the schools should not be terminated too

quickly following the first signs of progress.

4. Counselors with experience in counseling at the appropriate age level appear to be successful in obtaining positive results. It is suggested that counseling experience might be a variable worthy of consideration in future studies.

5. On the basis of the benefits apparently derived by some students as a result of the counseling treatment in this and other studies, the continuance of group counseling in schools seems to be warranted.

6. The variation in gains made by the counseled students indicates that counseling was considerably more beneficial to some students than it was for others. Further research is suggested, with the group counseling treatment extended over a longer period of time possibly in conjunction with other helping procedures for those who fail to respond to short-term treatment.

7. The literature seems to suggest that the utilization of either individual counseling, teacher guidance, or both, to supplement group counseling might be more effective than group counseling alone. It is recommended that further research be done to test this hypothesis.

8. Some correlates of peer acceptance such as those referred to in the literature, might be investigated in relation to sociometric status changes. From such research it may be possible to predict more readily which individuals would be most likely to benefit from group counseling in terms of social status. Some studies have reported

evidence of improvement on criteria other than the sociometric status criteria under consideration. Anticipation of changes in and measurement on various peer acceptance correlates might be found to produce significant differences in treatment effect which may not be evidenced by sociometric criteria alone.

9. Administration of the pretest by the teacher and utilization of the sociometric results for seating arrangements and for the organization of work groups as well as for the selection of subjects for group counseling might have some advantages. The results obtained could be used to provide the isolated child some contact with a preferred classmate and it might also provide greater motivation to the students for taking the test.

10. An explanation to parents of students involved in the study might be advisable, provided adequate control measures for this variable were taken. (A misunderstanding arose during the course of this study which was overcome through a subsequent discussion with the parent. Results of the study were not effected by the incident.)

11. Provision should be made to exclude as subjects those students who have been transferred from one classroom to another within the school, as well as those who have transferred in from another school. (One subject in the present study had recently transferred from another classroom in the school.)

Considering the brevity of the counseling treatment in this study, the treatment effect obtained seems to merit confidence in the potential of this method for raising the social status of some

children. Further research should be done with counseling carried on over a more extended time span, using a combination of individual and group counseling procedures and supplemented by teacher guidance techniques.

SELECTED REFERENCES

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Austin, M. C., and Thompson, G. G. Children's Friendships: A Study of the Basis on which Children Select and Reject their Best Friends. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948, 39, p. 101-116.
- Ausubel, D. P., Schiff, H. M., and Gasser, E. B. A Preliminary Study of Developmental Trends in Sociopathy: Accuracy of Perception of Own and Others' Sociometric Status. Child Development, 1952, 23, p. 111-128.
- Barclay, J. R. Sociometry: Rationale and Technique for Effecting Behavior Change in the Elementary School. Personnel and Guidance Journal, June, 1966, p. 1067-1076.
- Bass, B. M., and White, O. L. Validity of Leaderless Group Discussion Observer's Descriptive and Evaluative Ratings for the Assessment of Personality and Leadership Status. American Psychologist, 1950, 5, p. 311-312.
- Bedoian, V. H. Mental Health Analysis of Socially Over-Accepted Socially Under-Accepted, Average and Underage Pupils in the Sixth Grade. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, p. 366-371.
- Bernard, H. W. Mental Hygiene for Classroom Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1952.
- Biasco, F. The Effects of Individual Counseling, Multiple Counseling, and Teachers Guidance upon the Sociometric Status of Children Enrolled in Grades Four, Five, and Six. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Indiana University, 1965.
- Biddulph, L. G. Athletic Achievement and Personal and Social Adjustment of High School Boys. Research Quarterly, 1954, 25, p. 1-7.
- Bishop, J. K. "The Elementary School Counsellor's New Clothes." Paper read at the Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association Convention, Edmonton, June, 1969.
- Bjerstedt, A. The Interpretation of Sociometric Status Scores in the Classroom, 1956. In Gronlund, Sociometry in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, Pub. Inc., 1959.

- Blocker, D. H. Developmental Counseling. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1966, p. 175-176.
- Bonney, M. E. The Constancy of Sociometric Success and to Personality Self Ratings. Sociometry, 1943, 6, p. 409-424.
- Bonney, M. E. The Relative Stability of Social, Intellectual, and Academic Status in Grades II to IV, and the Interrelationships Between the Various Forms of Growth. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1943, 34, p. 88-102.
- Bonney, M. E. Popular and Unpopular Children: A Sociometric Study. Sociometry Monographs, No. 9, New York: Beaton House, 1947.
- Bonney, M. E., and Powell, J. Differences in Social Behavior between Sociometrically Low Children. Journal of Educational Research, 1953, 46, p. 481-495.
- Bonney, M. E. Mental Health in Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1960.
- Bower, E. M., Teshvonian, P. J., and Larson, C. A. A Procedure for Early Identification of Emotionally Disturbed Children. Bulletin 27. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1958.
- Breck, S. J. A Sociometric Measure of Status in Physical Education Classes. Research Quarterly, 1950, 21, p. 75-82.
- Bretsch, H. S. Social Skills and Activities of Socially Accepted and Unaccepted Adolescents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, p. 449-504.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. The Measurement of Sociometric Status, Structure and Development. Sociometry Monographs, No. 6, New York: Beacon House, 1945.
- Brown, D. Factors Affecting Social Acceptance of High School Students. School Review, 1954, 42, p. 151-155.
- Bruck, M., and Bodwin, R. F. The Relationship Between Self-Concept and the Presence and Absence of Scholastic Underachievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 18, p. 181-182.
- Byrd, E. A study of Validity and Constancy of Choices in a Sociometric Test. Sociometry, 1951, 14, p. 175-181.
- Campbell, J. D. Peer Relations in Childhood. In Hoffman, L., and Hoffman, M. Review of Child Development Research, Vol. I. Hartford Connecticut: Connecticut Printers, 1968.

- Campbell, J. O., and Yarrow, M. R. Perceptual and Behavior Correlates of Social Effectiveness. Sociometry, 1961, 24, p. 1-20.
- Clark, R. C. The Emerging Counsellor in Canada. Canadian Counsellor, January, 1970, 4, p. 5-9.
- Coleman, J. S. The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1961, (b).
- Coopersmith, S. A. Method of Determining Types of Self-esteem. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 59, p. 87-94.
- Cox, F. N. Sociometric Status and Individual Adjustment Before and After Play Therapy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, p. 354-356.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Child Development: The Emerging Self. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Developmental Counseling in the Elementary School. Personal and Guidance Journal, November, 1966, 45, p. 3.
- Dinkmeyer, D. C. Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School: Readings in Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1968.
- Dreikurs, R., and Sonstegard, M. The Teleoanalytic Approach to Group Counseling. The Alfred Adler Institute, Chicago, 1967. In Dinkmeyer, D. Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School: Readings in Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1968.
- English, H. B. Child Psychology. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952.
- Epperson, D. C. Some Interpersonal and Performance Correlates of Classroom Alienation. School Review, 1963, 71, p. 360-375.
- Epperson, D. C., Luski, M. B., and Schmuck, R. A. Interpersonal Relations and Mental Health in the Classroom. Inter-center Program of Research on Children, Youth, and Family Life. Unpublished report. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1961.
- Faust, V. History of Elementary School Counseling: Overview and Critique. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

- Feinberg, M. R., Smith, M., and Schmidt, R. An Analysis of Expressions Used by Adolescents at Varying Economic Levels to Describe Accepted and Rejected Peers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1958, 93, p. 133-148.
- Fink, M. B. Self-Concept as it Relates to Academic Achievement. California Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 13, p. 57-62.
- Fitzsimmons, M. J. The Predictive Value of Teachers' Referrals. In H. Krugmann (Ed.). Orthopsychiatry and the School. New York: American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1958.
- Frankel, E. B. The Social Relationships of Pre-school Children. Sociometry, 9, Nos. 2 and 3, 1946.
- Gade, E. M. The Sociometric Status, Predicted Status, Predictive Accuracy and the Scholastic Achievement of a Group of Sixth Grade Children. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1961.
- Gage, N. L., Leavitt, G. L., and Stone, G. C. Teachers' Understanding of their Pupils and Pupils' Ratings of their Teachers. Psychological Monographs, No. 21, American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., 1955.
- Gazda, G. M. Group Counseling: A Developmental Approach. Canadian Counsellor, Vol. 3, No. 4, October, 1969, p. 5-25.
- Gronlund, N. E. The Accuracy of Teachers' Judgments Concerning the Sociometric Status of Sixth-Grade Pupils. Sociometry Monographs, No. 25. New York: Beacon House, 1951.
- Gronlund, N. E. The Relative Stability of Classroom Social Status with Unweighted and Weighted Sociometric Status Scores. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1955, 46, p. 345-354.
- Gronlund, N. E. The Relative Ability of Homeroom Teachers and Special Subject Teachers to Judge the Social Acceptability of Pre-adolescent Pupils. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1955, 48, p. 381-391.
- Gronlund, N. E. Acquaintance Span of Sociometric Status Over Criteria in the Measurement of Social Acceptability. Elementary School Journal, 1955, 56, p. 173-176.
- Gronlund, N. E. Acquaintance Span and Sociometric Status. Sociometry, 1955, 18, p. 62-68.

- Gronlund, N. E. The General Ability to Judge Sociometric Status: Elementary Student Teachers' Sociometric Perceptions of Classmates and Pupils. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1956, 47, p. 147-157.
- Gronlund, N. E., and Anderson, L. Personality Characteristics of Socially Accepted, Socially Neglected, and Socially Rejected Junior High School Pupils. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1957, 43, p. 329-338.
- Gronlund, N. E., and Holmlund, W. S. "The Value of Elementary School Sociometric Status Scores for Predicting Pupils' Adjustment in High School. Educational Administration and Supervision, 1958, 44, p. 255-260.
- Gronlund, N. E., and Whitney, A. P. The Relation between Teachers' Judgments of Pupils' Sociometric Status and Intelligence. Elementary School Journal, 1958, 59, p. 264-268.
- Gronlund, N. E. Sociometry in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, Pub. Inc., 1959.
- Gronlund, N. E. Sociometry in the Classroom. New York: Harper and Row, Pub. Inc., 1965.
- Grossman, B., and Wrighter, J. The Relationship between Selection - Rejection and Intelligence, Social Status, and Personality Amongst Sixth Grade Children. Sociometry, 1948, 11, p. 345-355.
- Guinouard, D. E., and Ryschlak, J. F. Personality Correlates of Sociometric Popularity in Elementary School Children. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 40, p. 438-442.
- Hoffman, L., and Hoffman, M. Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- Hoffman, L., and Hoffman, M. Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 11. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966.
- Horowitz, F. D. The Relationship of Anxiety, Self-Concept, and Sociometric Status among Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grade Children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, p. 212-214.
- Hunt, M. McV., and Solomon, R. L. The Stability and Some Correlates of Group Status in a Summer Camp Group of Young Boys. American Journal of Psychology, 1942, 55, p. 33-45.
- Jennings, H. H. Leadership and Isolation. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1950.

- Kagan, J., and Moss, H. A. Birth to Maturity. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1962.
- Keislar, E. R. Peer Group Rating of High School Pupils with High and Low Marks. Journal of Experimental Education, 1955, 23, p. 375-378.
- Kranzler, G. D., Mayer, G. R., Dyer, C. O., and Munger, P. F. Counseling with Elementary School Children: An Experimental Study. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44, 9, May, 1966, p. 944-949.
- Krumboltz, J. D. A Behavioral Approach to Group Counseling and Therapy. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1968, 1, p. 4-5.
- Kuhlen, R. G., and Collister, E. G. Sociometric Status of Sixth and Ninth Graders who Fail to Finish High School. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1952, 12, p. 632-637.
- Lewis, M. D. Self-Concept and Learning: Breaking the Vicious Circle. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, March, 1968, p. 173-178.
- Lindzey, G. Handbook of Social Psychology, Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1954, Vol. 1, Ch. 11.
- Lippitt, R., and Gold, M. Classroom Social Structure as a Mental Health Problem. Journal of Social Issues, 1959, 15 (1), p. 40-49.
- Loban, W. A Study of Social Sensitivity (Sympathy) among Adolescents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, p. 102-112.
- Loeb, N. The Educational and Psychological Significance of Social Acceptability and its Appraisal in the Elementary School Setting. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1941.
- Lorber, N. M. Inadequate Social Acceptance and Disruptive Behavior. Journal of Educational Research, 59, 8, 1966.
- Lundholm, H. Reflections upon the Nature of Psychological Self. Psychological Review, 1940, 47, p. 110-127.
- Marshall, H., and McCandless, B. Relationships between Dependence on Adults and Social Acceptance by Peers. Child Development, XXVIII (1957), p. 413-419.

- Mayer, C. R., Kranzler, G. D., and Matthes, W. A. Elementary School Counseling and Peer Relations. Personnel and Guidance Journal, December, 1967, p. 360-365.
- McCandless, B. R. Children and Adolescents: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Meeks, Anna R. School Counselor, 1962, Vol. 10, p. 108-111.
- McCrow, L. W., and Tolbert, J. W. Sociometric Status and Athletic Ability of Junior High School Boys. Research Quarterly, 1953, 24, p. 72-80.
- Muma, J. R. Peer Evaluation and Academic Performance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, p. 405-409.
- Muma, J. R. Peer Evaluation and Academic Achievement in Performance Classes. Personnel and Guidance Journal, February 1968, p. 580-585.
- Munger, P. F., Winkler, R., Teigland, J., and Kranzler, G. D. Counseling and Guidance for Underachieving Fourth Grade Students. Cooperative Research Project, No. 2196, University of North Dakota, 1964.
- Mussen, P. H., and Porter, L. W. Personal Motivations and Self-Concepts Associated with Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness in Emergent Groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, p. 23-27.
- Newstetter, W. I., Feldstein, M. J., and Newcomb, T. M. Group Adjustment - a Study in Experimental Sociology. Cleveland: Western Reserve University, 1938.
- Northway, M. L. Appraisal of the Social Development of Children at a Summer Camp. University of Toronto Studies, Psychology Series, 1940, 5, 1, p. 31-70.
- Northway, M. L. Social Relationships Among Preschool Children: Abstracts and Interpretations of Three Studies. Sociometry, 1943, 6, p. 429-433.
- Northway, M. L. Outsiders: a Study of the Personality Patterns of Children Least Acceptable to their Age-Mates. Sociometry, 1944, 7, p. 10-25.
- Ohlsen, M. M., and Gazda, G. M. Counseling Underachieving Bright Pupils. Education, 1965, 86, p. 78-81.

- Ohlsen, M. A Rationale for the Elementary School Counselor. Guidance Journal, Fall, 1966, Vol. 5, No. 22.
- Oldridge, B. Assessing Outcomes of Group Counseling for Under-achieving Bright Fifth Graders and their Parents. Quarterly Progress Report to Cooperative Research Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, June, 30, 1964.
- Paterson, J. G. Developments in Elementary Counseling. Edmonton Public School Board Report, September, 1967.
- Paterson, J. G. Counselor Use of Group Techniques in School Situations. Canadian Counsellor, April, 1968, p. 88-96.
- Paterson, J. G. Elementary Counseling in Edmonton Schools. School Counsellors' Association of Manitoba Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 2, June, 1969, p. 38-42.
- Polansky, N., Lippitt, R., and Redl, F. An Investigation of Behavioral Contagion in Groups. Human Relations, 1950, 3, p. 319-348.
- Pope, B. Socio-Economic Contrasts in Children's Peer Culture Prestige Values. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1953, 48, p. 157-220.
- Porterfield, O. V., and Schlichting, H. F. Peer Status and Reading Achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 1961, 54, p. 291-297.
- Report of the ACES - ASCA Joint Committees on the Elementary School Counselor, April 2, 1966, (Working Paper). In Dinkmeyer, D., Counseling in the Elementary School: Readings in Theory and Practise, 1968, p. 99-105.
- Ricciuti, H. N., and French, J. W. Analysis of Ratings of Leadership Potential at the U.S. Naval Academy. American Psychologist, 1951, 6, p. 392.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications and Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rosen, S., Levinger, G., and Lippitt, R. Desired Change in Self and Others as a Function of Resource Ownership. Human Relations, 1960, 13, p. 187-193.
- Sarbin, T. R. A Preface to a Psychological Analysis of the Self. Psychological Review, 1952, 59, p. 11-22.

- Schmuck, R. A. Social-emotional Characteristics of Classroom Peer Groups. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.
- Schmuck, R. A. Some Relationships of Peer Liking Patterns in the Classroom to Pupil Attitudes and Achievement. School Review, 1963, 71, p. 337-359.
- Schmuck, R. A. Sociometric Status and Utilization of Academic Abilities. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 8, 1965, p. 172.
- Schmuck, R. A., and Van Egmond, E. Sex Differences in the Relationship of Interpersonal Perceptions to Academic Performance. Psychology in the Schools, 1965, 2, p. 32-40.
- Schoeppe, A., and Havighurst, R. J. A Validation of Development and Adjustment Hypothesis of Adolescence. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1952, 43, p. 339-353.
- Sears, P. S. A Look at Measures of Achievement Motivation. Paper read at American Psychological Association Symposium on Achievement Motivation and Achievement Anxiety in Children, 1959.
- Shaw, M. C., and Wursten, R. Research on Group Procedures in Schools: A Review of the Literature. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, p. 27-34.
- Smith, G. Sociometric Study of Best-Liked and Least-Liked Children. Elementary School Journal, 1950, 51, p. 77-85.
- Smith, L. M. The Concurrent Validity of Six Personality Adjustment Tests for Children. Psychological Monographs, 1958, 74 (4), p. 1-30.
- Snygg, D., and Combs, A. W. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Spielberger. Abstracts of Group and Multiple Counseling Research. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1, 2, Winter, 1968, Athen, Ga.: College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Teigland, J., Winkler, R. C., Munger, P. F., and Kranzler, G. D. Some Concomitants of Under-Achievement at the Elementary School Level. In Koplitz, E. D. Guidance in the Elementary School: Theory, Research, and Practice. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co. Pub., 1968.

- Thompson, G. G., and Powell, M. An Investigation of the Rating-Scale Approach to the Measurement of Social Status. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1951, 11, p. 440-455.
- Tindall, R. H. Relationships Among Indices of Adjustment Status. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1955, 15, p. 152-162.
- Travers, R. M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.
- Tuddenham, R. D. Studies in Reputation: III. Correlates of Popularity Among Elementary School Children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1951, 42, p. 257-276 (a).
- Van Egmond, E. E. Social Interrelationship Skills and Effective Utilization of Intelligence in the Classroom. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1960.
- Van Hoose, W., Peters, M., and Leonard, G. The Elementary School Counselor. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.
- Van Hoose, W. H. Counseling in the Elementary Schools. Plymouth, Mich.: F. E. Peacock, Pub. Inc., 1968.
- Walsh, A. M. Self-Concepts of Bright Boys with Learning Difficulties. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.
- Wattenberg, W. W., and Clifford, C. Relationship of the Self-Concept to Beginning Achievement in Reading. Cooperative Research Project #377. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1962.
- Wattenberg, W. W., and Clifford, C. Relationship of Self-Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading. Child Development, 1964, 35, p. 461-467.
- Williams, M. F. Acceptance and Performance Among Gifted Elementary School Children. Educational Resources Bulletin, November, 1958, 37, p. 219-224.
- Williams, R. L., and Cole, S. Self-Concept and School Adjustment. Personnel and Guidance Journal, January, 1968, p. 478-481.

Witryol, S. L., and Thompson, G. G. An Experimental Comparison of the Stability of Social Acceptability Scores Obtained with the Partial-Rank-Order and the Paired-Comparison Scales. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, p. 20-30.

Wrenn, G. Small Group Counseling. Counseling and Guidance Bulletin, Department of Education. Alberta: September, 1969, p. 11.

Wright, E. W. Multiple Counseling: Why? When? How? In McGowan, J. F., and Schmidt, L. D. Counseling: Readings in Theory and Practice. New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

NAME _____ ROOM _____
SCHOOL _____ DATE _____

You are asked to answer the following questions carefully. Do not tell anyone or let anyone see which choices you have made. Your classmates will not be told which choices you make.

Please write the first names and the initial of the last name.

You may choose only members of your class but you may name the same person more than once. Absent members may be included.

MAKE SURE YOU FILL IN ALL THE BLANK SPACES

1. Name the three children you would most like to have sit near you in class.

2. When you are playing at recess which children would you like best to play with you?

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO COUNSELORS*

The amount and type of leadership or direction provided by the counselors is expected to vary somewhat from one group to another, depending upon your own orientation and preference and the needs of your particular group. However, the following suggestions are offered as a general guide to ensure a measure of uniformity among the four counseling groups.

Purposes:

As these children do not appear to be readily accepted by their peers, they may be expected to have rather negative self-concepts and be somewhat lacking in the ability to relate well to others in a group. The counseling experience is intended to help them develop more positive feelings about themselves and to become more confident and effective in working out satisfying interpersonal relationships. The children might be encouraged to see the counseling experience as an opportunity to gain a better understanding of their own feelings, motives, and behavior and to develop a positive approach in resolving and helping others resolve their personal problems.

Selection:

Emphasis should be placed on the possible benefits that might be derived from the counseling experience rather than on the members' apparent lack of peer acceptance. It would be preferable to avoid any reference to the basis upon which the members were selected, rather than risk possible reinforcement of any feelings of isolation or rejection. Should the question arise, it might be briefly stated that they were chosen from a larger group who, like themselves, seemed not to have a wide range of associates in their classroom. They should not be told, for example, that they received no choices on the socio-metric test (some did receive one choice) or that they received the fewest choices (no fewer than those in the control group). You can, in all honesty, say that you do not know precisely how many choices any individual received. It might be mentioned that group counseling has been found helpful to older students and we are interested to see how much benefit they will gain from it. If they feel that it helped them, others may be given the same opportunity.

*These instructions are not an exact duplicate of those distributed in written form to the counselors. Included here are directives that were given verbally as well as those sent in the form of various written memoranda to them. These were agreed upon in principle by the counselors.

Structure:

Topics to be dealt with may be determined by the expressed concerns and needs of the group members. They should also take some responsibility in setting and enforcing their own limits and ensuring that no member is either left out or allowed to monopolize the group. The counselor's role shall be that of a group member who helps clarify feelings and issues and guides the group toward positive outcomes and insights. Matters of confidentiality and trust, as well as the need for establishing attitudes of mutual acceptance, helpfulness, support and cooperation among group members should be dealt with in the first meeting.

Stability:

Group members should be told that their teachers are willing to excuse them from class for these meetings, which will take place each week for a period of two months. It would be advisable to obtain from the members at least a tentative commitment to remain in the group for the full period of time. However, should a member express reluctance to continue in the group after it has begun meeting, it would be preferable to discuss this with him and if possible, persuade him to stay, allowing him the option to withdraw at a later time should his presence in the group appear to be detrimental to himself or others. The members should also be advised that no new members may be added to the group.

APPENDIX C

TO THE TEACHER:

Permission to involve some children in your classroom in a group-counseling situation once a week over a two-month period is requested. The students taking part in the study would be selected on the basis of a short test designed to identify those sharing a common problem concerning relationships with their peers. This should take approximately ten minutes and would be administered by the counselor. It is anticipated that the students chosen will be among those you would normally designate as being in need of assistance.

The counseling sessions would range from 30 to 60 minutes once a week. The exact length of any particular session would be left to the discretion of the counselor and yourself, depending upon time available and the needs of the participants.

At the end of the two-month period, counseling would be terminated and another test would be administered to determine the effectiveness of the counseling treatment. Another test early in February is planned as a means of observing the amount of carry-over resulting from the experience.

The students who are found to be in need of help in this area will be identified to you. This information should, of course, be treated as confidential to yourself and the counselor. Half of these are to be involved in group-counseling, the remaining half comprising the control group. If at anytime, you feel that any of these people require individual counseling, for any other

legitimate reason, it is quite permissible to refer them to the counselor for individual help, as you would any other student in your class. Participation in the study would not then deprive them of assistance that would normally be available to them.

No information about the students nor any report regarding their progress is required. Administration and scoring of the tests and selection of subjects for the two groups will be carried out by the counselor in your school and myself. As a close working-relationship between teacher and counselor is so important at the elementary level, the study places no restrictions on the usual amount of communication and you are free to discuss any aspect of the child's behavior, school performance, needs, etc., with the counselor at anytime, as would be your normal practice.

It is hoped that the involvement of your students in this project will be of sufficient benefit to them to justify the time devoted to it, and that it will not interfere too greatly with your regular program but rather tend to compliment your work with them.

Your cooperation in this will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy J. Charuk

APPENDIX D

10751 - 67 Street,
Edmonton 80, Alberta,
May 2nd, 1969.

To: Principals, Counselors, and Grade Five Teachers:

In September, 1968, you kindly agreed to assist in a research project involving group counseling with six fifth-grade students in your school. Your willing cooperation and assistance has been greatly appreciated, as without it, this study could not have been undertaken.

It was my intention to convey to you, at this time, the outcome of that study. Unfortunately, the data is yet to be processed but it is hoped that this may be completed during the coming summer.

I am aware that involvement in this project has, for some of you, resulted in some considerable inconvenience and a good deal of effort to ensure that all requirements could be met according to plan. For your continued patience and generous support, I am most grateful.

Yours sincerely,

Dorothy J. Charuk

APPENDIX E

A SAMPLE GROUP COUNSELING SITUATION*

The following account is an approximation of an actual group counseling session with grade six boys, reconstructed by the counselor from memory. Although it lacks precision of detail and is somewhat abbreviated it is intended, nevertheless, to give the reader an idea of what may occur in a fairly typical group counseling situation.

This group of boys came for counseling on a self-referral basis intermittently over a period of about two years. Although the topics varied from one meeting to the next, they usually involved some aspect of social behavior or interpersonal relationships. This was a rather exuberant group. The dialogue and interaction taking place between the members was, as a rule, considerably more dynamic than is indicated in the account presented here.

Bob: It's about Ted. Everybody, nearly...except us...just like that...turned against him, and man, he's taking it real bad. They act like he's got fleas or something.

Cnslr: Ted, you are feeling pretty down, aren't you? Would you care to tell us about it?

Ted: Well, I uh - I think I know what it is, I mean...well, all I can think of is, like I told you before, I brag too much.

*The students in this group were not subjects in the present study, nor were they deemed social isolates. No record of a counseling session with the subjects was kept. This decision was made in order to preserve the confidence of all subjects in the study.

I...uh...get excited and I don't think how I sound - I don't mean I'm better than the rest but just feel good, I guess, when I make a good play or get the best mark and I guess I want everybody to know about it. You know how I get all wound up....

Cnslr: Um-hm.

Ted: Well, and I guess I act like some big-shot or something... And the girls...you know how, well, the way they kind of always pay attention to me and write notes and stuff, and I guess it sort of went to my head or something...and now for no big reason...everybody, just about...hates me.

Bob: That's right. Ted's a really great guy...but he turns people against him when he sort of...well, kind of brags about himself.

Jack: It's like he's trying to be a big wheel, but he really isn't. Like, he always praises somebody on a good play and says it's okay if one of us goofs...and when he loses he never gets mad and yells cheat. He's a good guy - he's big but he gives us little guys a fair chance and he cheers for us and stuff like that.

Ted: Ya, well, but I get noising it up about myself too...I guess I think I'm being funny but they...well, maybe it doesn't seem funny to them...and then somebody says something, like Susan there today...and I feel like I could go and crawl in a hole someplace.

Bob: Susan's a big mouth...blab, blab, blab!

Jack: Boy, you can say that again. Girls!

Jerry: Hey, you guys, not so loud.

Ted: Ya, Well, Susan...I don't know...she's...well, maybe she was right..she's sure clued in...if it was somebody else... and all the kids like her. Oh boy, and me, always trying to make such a big impression...some big hero!

Ken: Hey, how come the girls always go ga-ga over Ted?

Bob: It's the way he blinks those big baby-blues at 'em, eh Teddy-Baby?

Jack: Aw, do we have to talk about girls? Just because of some dumb thing Susan said?

Jim: Ya, I'm bored already.

Jerry: It was what Susan said that started all this, though wasn't it? It's the girls that are most mad at Ted and they liked him....

Ted: Well, not now. It's like a conspiracy. I'm poison.

Jack: So who needs 'em? You've still got us.

Cnslr: What did you mean, Ted...a conspiracy?

Ted: Well, the sudden switch...they ignore me...it's like I'm a stranger. If I say something funny they make a stupid face, or go like this like...like I'm some kind of nut. Makes me feel like a freak.

Cnslr: Like you'd suddenly sprouted another head and everybody knew it but you.

Ted: Ya. Spooky.

Cnslr: Whereas before, they'd have laughed with you - not at you - and you think it has to do with your sounding boastful.

Ted: Right. I'm not bragging but everybody says I'm a born comedian...I have a great sense of humor, I'll admit that...and there's nothing wrong with my personality, or...

Jack: There you go, Ted.

Jim: You're doing it again, Champ.

Ken: Like you say, you're a smash...so what's the big problem?

Jerry: Don't you see it, Ted? I mean what you just did...it's okay if we say it but it sounds so braggy when you do it.

Ted: I'm just being honest. It's true - ask anybody. It's no crime. I don't know why everybody...

Jerry: Okay. You know you're funny and we know you're funny... so...

Bob: So you don't need to say it.

Jerry: You keep reminding us that you're good in school, you're good in sports, funny and popular, and oh yes, good-looking...how do you think it makes the rest of us feel...'cause, man, you're the greatest.

Ted: I guess...I'm a pretty big phony...I...

Jerry: I didn't mean that.

Cnslr: Maybe what they're trying to say is that you really are all those things, and they really do like you, but they don't like hearing you say it. At least not in a way that puts somebody else down.

Ted: I never meant...to put anybody down...maybe that's what I do, though. How come, I was way up there this morning and then one little word from somebody...like Susan...and I feel like a creep. You guys could say what she did and it wouldn't be a big thing.

Cnslr: Why do you suppose that is, Ted?

Jack: We're his fans and loyal supporters, eh, Ted?

Ted: Well, ya, we kind of stick up for each other, and if we get mad we know what we're mad about.

Jim: Those girls...they won't level...it's all a big secret.

Cnslr: Jerry, you've been anxious to say something.

Jerry: Well, it's about what Susan said. You see, Ann had a really good idea for a play and everybody liked it, and then Ted came up with another idea - it wasn't any better - but because it was Ted's everybody voted for it.

Ken: Ya, that's right.

Jerry: Then Ted made a big thing out of it and I think everybody - some of us - felt kind of sorry for Ann. I voted for Ted's too, but I kind of wished afterwards I'd voted for Ann's - the way she looked I guess. And that's when Susan said something about giving Ted a twenty-one gun salute and the Nobel Prize or something. I went to the dentist right after that and I didn't think anymore about it. Didn't think it was all that serious.

Ted: You know, I couldn't figure Susan making a remark like that - she isn't like that - oh boy, no wonder they're all mad at me - I didn't even think how Ann felt - she didn't say anything.... But then, she wouldn't. She's kind of shy. Boy, how stupid can I get? Don't even know what I said....

Bob: You're not stupid, Ted...you just act that way sometimes.

Ted: I guess. Boy, I really feel dumb...honest, I didn't mean it that way.

Cnslr: We know you didn't - I guess we don't always see ourselves the way others see us, do we? Kind of helps to know what we're doing that bugs them though, doesn't it? Then we can work on it...you will, won't you?

Ken: He'd better.

Ted: Ya, boy, I'd hate to go through that again. They never did that before. If I forget, you guys tell me, okay?

Jim: Sure, but what about the play? They're still mad at you.

Ted: Oh, well, I can go and ask the teacher if we can drop mine.

Bob: But we voted for it.

Ted: Well, Ann's was better.... I'd feel better. Maybe then they'd sort of forget about me and what I did.

Jerry: Sounds okay to me - I'll go with you to help explain it, okay?

Jim: Could we come again next week and tell you how it went?

I have something to talk about but I want these guys to come...it sort of concerns everybody.

Cnslr: Um-hm...do you think you could come at 3:30? It seems to be the only time I have left....

Ted: That's okay. We can come then...our teacher won't mind ...oh, uh, if you're talking to her...it's okay if you tell her about this...anything we said. She asked if I was alright, but it's kind of hard to explain and all the kids were there....

Cnslr: Yes, I can see that it would be. Okay, I'll do that and I'll tell her you'd like a chance to talk to her about it yourself, too, when the others aren't around.

Ted: I'd sure appreciate it. Thanks again...see you next week.

B29950